

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

REGIONAL LISTENING SESSION MEETING NOTES

PHOENIX, ARIZONA
JUNE 22, 2000

Views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision unless so designated by other official documentation.

June 2000

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS REGIONAL LISTENING SESSION MEETING NOTES

**PHOENIX, ARIZONA
JUNE 22, 2000**

by

Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd.
6352 South U.S. Highway 51
P.O. Box 1316
Carbondale, IL 62903
(618) 549-2832

A Report Submitted to:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Institute for Water Resources
7701 Telegraph Road
Alexandria, VA 22315-3868

under

Task Order #25
Contract No. DACW72-99-D-0005

June 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Regional Listening Sessions Meeting Notes – Phoenix, Arizona	1
Welcoming Remarks.....	1
Session Objectives	3
Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1 st Group Discussion)	4
Responsibilities and Actions Needed to Meet the Challenges (2 nd Group Discussion)	7
Challenge #1 – Identify and Delineate Floodplains.....	7
Challenge #2 – 404 Permit Process Takes Too Long	8
Challenge #3 – Improve Rural and Urban Water Resources Infrastructure	9
Challenge #4 – Clearly Define the Roles of All Federal Agencies	10
Challenge #5 – Holistic Approach to Natural Resource Management	10
Closing Remarks and Adjournment	11
Appendix A Transcription of Comments Regarding Identified Challenges	A-1
Appendix B Submitted Public Statements and Materials	B-1

REGIONAL LISTENING SESSIONS MEETING NOTES – PHOENIX, ARIZONA

The notes provided below document the main points that were offered during the Listening Session in Phoenix, Arizona on June 22, 2000. The notes highlight and summarize the key topics and issues that were discussed at the meeting. Selected attachments are provided in this document.

Water plays a major role in how we live and work. As steward of America's water resources for more than 200 years, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has begun a dialogue with the American public, stakeholders, customers, and government agencies at all levels about the water resources challenges that lie ahead. The Corps is conducting 16 regional public listening sessions throughout the United States between June and November of 2000 to provide citizens the opportunity to voice concerns about pressing water resources problems, opportunities, and needs impacting their lives, communities, and future sustainability. This dialogue is an integral part of the Corps's strategic planning process.

The cities where listening sessions are being conducted include St. Louis, MO, Sacramento, CA, Phoenix, AZ, Woburn, MA, Atlanta, GA, Omaha, NE, Honolulu, HI, Chicago, IL, Louisville, KY, Dallas, TX, Williamsburg, VA, New Brunswick, NJ, Anchorage, AK, Vancouver, WA, San Diego, CA, and Washington, D.C.

This report summarizes the Phoenix, Arizona, listening session. This session, hosted by the South Pacific Division, was conducted on June 22, 2000 at the Phoenix Airport Embassy Suites Hotel. Approximately 38 people attended this meeting to share their views with the Corps.

The information collected from the listening sessions will be incorporated into a report assessing future national water resources needs and the gaps that must be closed to meet these needs. This report will be shared with key decision-makers within the Army and Congress to help inform their discussions about water resources issues and future investment decisions. Additionally, the report will provide a point of departure for ensuing discussions with other Federal agencies to identify common water resources issues and missions most appropriate to the roles and responsibilities of the Federal government. The information will also be incorporated into a revision of the Civil Works Program Strategic Plan.

Welcoming Remarks

Brigadier General Peter Madsen, USACE South Pacific Division Commander, welcomed the audience to the meeting. He thanked the audience for attending and explained that it is important for every government agency to meet with the public and listen objectively about how that agency is performing. He presented the intent of the workshop as a forum to hear from all of the audience members and better understand what water resource needs are important both to the

nation and to the audience in particular. He explained that this process will give the Corps a better idea of what the Federal government is or is not doing well across the country.

General Madsen went on to share the perspective of the Corps with the audience. The Corps has worked for over 200 years on projects such as navigation, flood control, and more recently, environmental protection and restoration. He referenced six identified water resources challenges facing the nation in the near future, and said that these are only a starting point for discussion. The General cited several examples of such future needs. Shipping will double in 20 years, and it is necessary to upgrade our ports and harbors. Flooding in particular is a concern in the southwestern United States, as flash floods often have devastating effects in this area. Flood control projects historically have provided a good return on investment to the nation. Environmental restoration is a relatively new charge for the Corps, but it is now a component of nearly all Corps projects. The Corps recognizes the importance of this activity, and that much of the damage done to the environment in the past needs to be corrected. Many communities still lack adequate water and sewer systems. Many blighted areas and brownfields exist in our urban areas, and this is a challenge for society. Current water resources infrastructure across the country may not be adequate for future needs. Many projects are not being adequately maintained; the nation has invested less over the years than it should to adequately maintain these structures.

Lastly, the General indicated that the Corps is often called upon to address emergency situations. For example, the Corps is currently working on flood control and housing projects at Los Alamos, New Mexico in the wake of recent devastating wildfires. Right now, the nation is preparing for another hurricane season, and there is the potential for more fires in the southwest this year.

The General closed by noting that the Corps wants to know if these are appropriate roles for the Federal government, and if so, what the Corps in particular should be doing. The listening sessions are geared toward learning how the Federal government is doing, and what they should be doing. All of the information gathered in Phoenix and elsewhere will be compiled in a report which will be posted on the Corps' "national challenges" website at <http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/waterchallenges>.

One member of the audience asked General Madsen to explain the difference between the Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation (Bureau) in terms of their missions in the western United States. General Madsen replied that the Bureau's mission in the West is primarily to provide water supply, whereas the Corps' mission in the West primarily involves flood control, with numerous secondary purposes, such as water storage and recreation. As such, there is some overlap between Corps and Bureau missions. A member of the audience representing the Bureau added that the General's answer was correct; in many cases the Bureau builds the water supply structure while Corps builds the flood control measures in conjunction with this structure (Roosevelt Dam outside of Phoenix, Arizona is a good example of this). General Madsen added that the two agencies work together because many projects serve multiple purposes.

Session Objectives

After General Madsen's introduction, Mr. Dale Brown, the session facilitator representing the contractor, Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd., began by explaining the format of the workshop and his role as a professional facilitator. Mr. Brown first explained that the listening sessions were designed in order to get input from everyone. Participants were invited to provide any written statements to the session recorder, and they were also invited to leave any handouts on the registration table for other audience members to take with them when they leave. Also, Mr. Brown noted that if a participant wanted to provide a written statement but did not bring one to the workshop, it would be possible to send such a statement as an e-mail attachment to the above-referenced Corps website. Mr. Brown also explained that the purpose of these listening sessions was not to discuss specific Corps projects, and that if an audience member had concerns about a particular project, they were to speak with Mr. Frank Rezac, a Public Affairs Officer from the Corps who was present at the workshop.

Mr. Brown then briefly outlined the proposed agenda of the current workshop for the audience. Although the agenda was intended to serve as a general guide to the day's activities, the agenda could be modified at the facilitator's discretion as appropriate for the particular audience. The agenda was presented as follows:

10:00-10:25 (A.M.)	Welcome
10:25-10:45	Overview of Workshop
10:45-11:40	Table Discussions
11:40-12:25 (P.M.)	Large Group Discussions (Plenary)
12:25-12:30	Dot Voting
12:30-1:30	Lunch
1:30-2:10	First Small Group Answer Session
2:10-2:45	Second Small Group Answer Session
2:45-3:00	Break
3:00-3:45	Large Group Discussions (Plenary)
3:45-4:00	Closing Remarks
4:00-5:00	Informal Discussions

After reviewing the agenda, Mr. Brown explained that the goal of the meeting was to obtain the answers to the following four questions:

1. What are the key water resource challenges facing this region?
2. Why is it a problem, and what will be the impact?
3. What actions should be taken to respond to the challenge?
4. Who should take these actions? What should the Federal government do to address the problem?

The first task assigned to the audience was to name a group spokesperson for each table. That person would be designated to report out on behalf of the entire table. Mr. Brown went on to explain that at least one member of the Corps would be sitting at each table to listen to the

discussions and assist the group if asked, but that they had been instructed not to serve as the spokesperson for the table.

Once the spokespersons had been chosen, two directions would be presented to the audience for them to discuss in small groups at the tables. The first direction would be to identify the water challenges that people at the table thought were important; the second direction would be to discuss why they were important. The spokesperson for each table was also instructed to create a crisp, concise statement of each challenge as identified by the group, as well as develop a brief analysis of the challenges. As each spokesperson reported on the challenges generated at their table, a Corps staff member would capture a concise statement of each challenge and project it onto a screen for all to see.

Finally, Mr. Brown urged the audience members to follow and trust the process, as it was carefully designed to gather the most information from each participant. Most of the day's activities would involve working in small groups in order to achieve the maximum interaction among the participants. Following these instructions, the participants were then asked to begin discussing water resource challenges at their tables.

Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1st Group Discussion)

The participants were grouped into six tables of approximately seven or eight people per table. After approximately an hour of discussion, Mr. Brown went around the room and asked the spokesperson from each table to give a concise statement of the challenge or challenges identified by the participants at the table. While one member of the Corps staff projected onto a screen each challenge as it was identified, other Corps staff wrote each challenge on a separate piece of butcher paper, each of which were then affixed to a wall of the conference room. The workshop participants identified twenty-three separate challenges:

- A. The Corps should become a national resource for national watershed programs, by acting as a broad-based resource for proactive, national watershed management. The Corps should treat watersheds as a whole, looking at all of the needs within the watershed itself, because each watershed functions as a distinct unit.
- B. The 404 Permit process take too long; funding opportunities are lost, or projects can't be maintained. The Corps is perceived as a regulator, rather than a facilitator.
- C. Implement regional planning for water issues, including better regional cooperation and planning among various agencies, cities and municipalities. This approach can expedite projects and avoid litigation.
- D. Take a holistic approach to natural resource management; there is too much emphasis on "Band-Aids," not enough attention to entire watershed system.
- E. The Corps must be more proactive instead of reactive; it must adequately maintain flood control projects, and must take emergency maintenance actions quickly after damage has been done.
- F. Clearly define the missions, roles and regulations of all Federal agencies, including the Corps; it is very confusing to the public.

- G. Lack of Federal money means that problems get dumped on local agencies, which may not be equipped to handle the problem. Rural jurisdictions have the least resources to handle problems.
- H. More consistency in Corps regulatory functions/policies; this will avoid delays.
- I. Rural and urban water/sewer infrastructure needs to be improved; emphasize water re-use and maintenance of old structures.
- J. Need to recognize value of both structural and non-structural flood control projects; there is a need for both types of solutions.
- K. Availability, reliability and accessibility of water resources; it is imperative to identify new sources of water and protect water quality.
- L. Resolve changing and conflicting priorities among stakeholders (e.g., among users of a river system).
- M. Open up communications to non-sponsor stakeholders; e.g. One city's waste water is the next city's water supply, so the Corps needs to talk to the second (i.e., non-sponsor) city as well.
- N. Focus on non-structural solutions and approaches to flood control; people don't want concrete ditches, Congress should pay FEMA to implement non-structural solutions.
- O. Identify and delineate floodplains, including the ordinary high-water mark; it will prevent development from occurring in floodplains. Floodplain maps badly need to be updated.
- P. Federal money seems to go to those who need it the least; i.e., cities that know how to get funds from Congress receive more money, rather than the disadvantaged or rural communities. Need more equitable disbursement of funds.
- Q. Need to clarify water rights in the Western United States.
- R. Corps projects must place emphasis on public beneficiary rather than private beneficiaries; funding comes from public sector and must have public benefit, rather than going to projects for special interest groups.
- S. Regional regulations/solutions for regional problems. Corps should develop more succinct definitions in its permitting process; definitions created to solve problems in the East don't necessarily apply in the West.
- T. Environmental regulations are unfair and are based on poor science; Federal government needs to have consistency within the regulatory process.
- U. Develop creative solutions to water supply, such as water marketing, desalinization, use of icebergs. Use the water supply that is closest to an area (e.g., Los Angeles should desalinate water from the ocean rather than taking water from sources far away).
- V. Corps must re-examine cost-sharing percentages of local sponsors; percentages of funding required from local sponsors has been raised, and this can hurt rural areas that aren't able to fund the projects that they need.
- W. Corps must address lack of project implementation; many emergency programs on the books have not yet been built by the Corps, and it is now necessary to revisit these programs and determine whether to fund/build them.

After the last challenge was identified, Mr. Brown thanked the group and advised the audience that at any time during the day they were welcome to fill out a yellow "sticky" note for any challenge of personal interest and stick it on the appropriate banner for that challenge, for as

many challenges as they wished. A transcription of the comments written on the “stickies” is provided in Appendix A.¹

Mr. Brown then explained to the group that, although each challenge identified by the audience was important to the Corps and would be included in the meeting report, due to time constraints it would be possible to discuss only a few of the challenges in detail. Therefore, all of the participants were asked to vote on all of the challenges using adhesive dots in order to identify which challenges were of most concern to the group in general. Sheets of adhesive dots were placed on each table. Each non-Corps workshop participants then took four dots and affixed them beside the challenge or challenges of most interest to him or her. The four dots could be distributed in any way the individual saw fit, such as one dot per challenge or all four dots on a single challenge. The group spokespersons then tallied the results of the dot voting.

The dots beside each lettered challenge were distributed as follows:

A	5	M	4
B	13	N	12
C	9	O	14
D	13	P	6
E	2	Q	4
F	10	R	3
G	0	S	2
H	7	T	1
I	10	U	5
J	1	V	0
K	2	W	0
L	9		

The eight challenges most favored by the audience were:

O	(14 votes)	Identify and delineate floodplains
B	(13)	404 permit process is too slow
D	(13)	Holistic approach to natural resource management
N	(12)	Consider non-structural remedies for flood control
F	(10)	Clearly define the roles of federal agencies
I	(10)	Improve rural and urban water resources infrastructure
C	(9)	Regional planning for water needs
L	(9)	Resolve changing/conflicting priorities among stakeholders

Before dismissing the audience for lunch, Mr. Brown explained that the eight challenges identified through the group voting exercise would be discussed in detail during the afternoon session.

¹ The authors of this report made every effort to accurately transcribe the handwritten comments from the “stickies” generated by the listening session participants; however, some comments may contain errors due to illegibility or incoherence of the original text.

Responsibilities and Actions Needed to Meet the Challenges (2nd Group Discussion)

After the participants returned from lunch, Mr. Brown explained the format for the remainder of the afternoon. He noted that the eight challenges singled out before lunch were written on butcher pads positioned around the room (one challenge per butcher pad). The participants would have the opportunity to discuss in detail two of the challenges that interested them by sitting at the table next to the appropriate butcher pad. Two back-to-back sessions of approximately 30 to 40 minutes each would be held; after the first half-hour, the participants were asked to get up, choose a different challenge, and begin a discussion at that table. In this way, each participant would have the opportunity to discuss in detail two challenges of particular concern to them. The facilitator asked for one volunteer to remain next to each butcher pad throughout the afternoon discussions and serve as the moderator and spokesperson for that discussion. This person would record the participant's ideas and suggestions for that challenge on the butcher pad.

Before commencing the first discussion period, three questions were posed to the group, and the participants were asked to develop the answers to these questions during their discussions. The answers would then be reported out to the entire audience at the end of the second discussion session. The three questions are:

1. What actions need to be taken to respond to the challenge?
2. Who should take the actions?
3. What are you or your group willing to do to make these actions happen, and what role should the Federal government play?

Audience members then gravitated into groups around several of the butcher pads and began deliberating with others in their group. The first discussion session went from 1:30 to 2:10. Mr. Brown then allowed people to move to a different table to discuss another challenge of importance to them. The second round discussion session went from 2:10 to 2:45. At the end of the discussions, Mr. Brown asked the spokesperson for each challenge to restate the challenge and provide the answers to the three questions. Although eight challenges were originally identified as suitable for further discussion, only five challenges were reported on; two challenges (regional planning and resolving conflicts among stakeholders) were incorporated into the discussion of the "holistic approach" challenge, and another challenge (non-structural flood remedies) was not discussed at all in a small group. The results of the discussions on the challenges are provided below:

Challenge #1 – Identify and Delineate Floodplains

What Action Should be Taken?

- Need to map the floodplains not already mapped by FEMA or where the map is obsolete.
- Mapping must be completed in a timely and cost-effective manner.

- Mapping should include ordinary high water mark.
- Mapping should take advantage of Corps technical expertise and FEMA administrative expertise.

Who Should Take Action?

- Corps should undertake the floodplain mapping, but must coordinate effort with FEMA.
- Local communities should decide which floodplains need to be delineated.

What Are You Willing To Do?

- Group members would help to organize flood management partners statewide (i.e., across Arizona).
- Urge Federal government to provide the funds and technical resources to delineate floodplains.

Challenge #2 – 404 Permit Process Takes Too Long

What Action Should be Taken?

- Increase communication between state and Federal governments.
- State governments should help local communities to apply for permits.
- Corps should sponsor training workshops on 404 permit process.
- Corps should provide better explanations of why permits applications are rejected.
- Increase Corps staff available to process permits.
- Certify others so that they can work on delineations.
- Need to clarify term “waters of the United States,” and how this definition applies to ephemeral streams in the West.
- Take regional differences into account in the permitting process, rather than nationwide standards.
- Improve permit checklist to include minimum requirements and describe which other agencies may be involved.

Who Should Take Action?

- Permit applicants could do early application footwork based on information contained in an improved application checklist.
- Local communities could lobby Congress for more funding for increased permit processing staff.
- Corps should undertake actions described above.
- Engineers in other state and Federal agencies could be trained to do certification and delineation.
- Other agencies could do their part in a timely fashion.

What Are You Willing To Do?

(The group did not directly address this item).

Other suggestions for improving the Corps 404 permit process were developed by the group during their discussion:

1. more consistency in answers and enforcement;
2. make the appeals process more publicly known;
3. provide internet access to denied permits so others can learn from mistakes;
4. review time limits within which Corps must decide on application;
5. make applicants pay a fee for having their permit reviewed, which could be used to pay for more staffing;
6. Corps personnel in regulatory programs must coordinate better with their counterparts in Corps planning departments;
7. Corps should be able to allocate staff more flexibly, i.e., specifically to transfer staff to offices that are flooded with permits.

Challenge #3 – Improve Rural and Urban Water Resources Infrastructure

What Action Should be Taken?

- Water and sewer systems need to be improved in many urban and rural areas.

Who Should Take Action?

- Local governments should define the problem(s) in their areas and take the lead on a local solution before involving Federal government.
- State and Federal governments need to develop more favorable cost-sharing formulas based on demographics, as many communities cannot afford the projects that they need.
- All government agencies should educate local communities on what the roles of the Federal, state and local governments are and link these roles together in a comprehensive strategy. Local communities need to know what programs and grants are available to them.
- NAD Bank should develop more favorable financing for small communities.
- Federal agencies, private organizations and academia should develop technological alternatives for water supply.
- Local governments should supply appropriate training for the personnel staffing their existing water resource facilities.
- All government agencies should consider combining funding sources, such as Block Grants and cost-sharing funds, particularly where there is not an adequate source of local funds.
- Federal agencies can utilize existing authorities to address water supply and wastewater needs.
- Federal and state governments should fully assess the quantity and quality of water in undeveloped or underdeveloped groundwater aquifers in arid regions lacking surface water supplies.
- Study how the issue of water rights impacts on wastewater discharges.

What Are You Willing To Do?

(The group did not directly address this item).

Challenge #4 – Clearly Define the Roles of All Federal Agencies

What Action Should be Taken?

All impacted Federal agencies need to meet jointly to determine:

- Current state of affairs of national water resources and how they will be approached in the near future.
- Define mission, roles and responsibilities of agencies, including examining combining agencies to reduce redundancy and mission overlap
- Prepare a report for Congress including action steps to be taken.
- Administration should adopt the report and support its findings.
- Comments on the report should be solicited from all Federal agencies and their stakeholders.
- Finalize the report.

Who Should Take Action?

Administration should work with Congress on this report. Report findings should establish the following in plain, concise language:

- Who does what, and why.
- Identifies changes to agencies if appropriate.
- Identifies financial resources required to administer, plan and implement programs and projects.
- Identify shortcomings.

What Are You Willing To Do?

(The group did not directly address this item).

Challenge #5 – Holistic Approach to Natural Resource Management

What Action Should be Taken?

- Implement “big picture” planning.
- Identify common goals (multiple objectives/ multiple uses). Seek maximum diversity in all ways.
- Identify all interests and get them involved early; keep inviting those parties that are initially reluctant to become involved, and invite those who you do not want to involve.
- Begin discussions before a problem develops.
- Stakeholder-driven, open process with facilitation.
- Take time to do it right, or take time to do it over.
- Understand that it will take 3 – 5 years to produce a product.
- State-Federal partnership is needed to convene the process.
- Stop duplication of effort and turf wars between agencies.
- Address local sub-watershed areas simultaneously.
- Process must allow for more than one priority at a time.
- Create measurable, implementable action steps.

- Consolidate past watershed work through a national clearinghouse.
- Look for “win-win” solutions to regional concerns.
- Communicate, communicate, communicate.
- Establish an ongoing, flexible process.

Who Should Take Action?

- Local organizations should become involved.
- A state-Federal umbrella could provide funding to support the process

What Are You Willing To Do?

(The group did not directly address this item).

What role should the Federal government play?

- Federal agencies should get involved in a locally led process to identify the resources and the “players”.
- Piggyback on the research efforts of the University of Arizona.
- Publicize the results of this process in various newspapers, newsletters and websites.
- Eventually incorporate this information into school curriculums
- Stop hiding information from the public and stop making it difficult to bring people together through policies, etc.
- Federal government can provide expertise, money and involvement.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

As a final order of business, Mr. Brown asked the workshop participants to fill out comment sheets if they had not already done so and leave them with the Corps staff.²

In closing, General Madsen thanked everyone for attending and told them to look for the report of the day’s meeting on the appropriate Corps website. He explained that when all of the regional listening sessions were finished, a compendium report would be posted on this website as well. He stated that this report would be presented to Congress and to the Administration, and that the results contained in the report may in fact lead to policy change.

General Madsen said that it was heartening to get such quality information from a professional group. Finally, the General offered his personal observations of the workshop. He began by saying that, although the listening sessions are just beginning, already it is possible to get a sense of some of the themes that will come out of this exercise. It is likely that all sixteen sessions will discuss the Corps regulatory program. He explained that, in the regulatory program, the Corps asks Congress for more resources every year, and each year the Corps is turned down. The General further opined that Congress seems to expand the regulatory role, but

² In order to obtain feedback for internal use by the Corps on the effectiveness of the listening sessions, Corps personnel placed comment forms on each table for the participants to complete. These were collected by the Corps personnel as the participants left the meeting.

not the funding needed to make the regulatory program run more efficiently (with more staffing, etc.) The General thought that the audience had provided Corps with valuable public input about how the regulatory program should be run.

Regarding taking a holistic approach to natural resources management, the General noted that it is becoming more popular. The Corps had always worked on an individual project basis, but now it is apparent that the Corps needs to view problems in a watershed context. The General suggested that, while this is the right approach from an engineering point of view, it is a more difficult approach politically, because it is harder to fund projects this way. By way of example, the General noted a meeting in Oceanside, California a few weeks ago at which the need to place more sediment on the beach was expressed even though the sediment would vanish within in a few years. Therefore, it is necessary to look at a solution in terms of the entire coastline.

In addition, the General noted that infrastructure needs will become more and more apparent in the southwest and in the west. When it comes to infrastructure, most people think instantly of buildings and highways and the fact that you need to constantly maintain them. But people do not tend to think of water resource infrastructure and the need to maintain it. General Madsen suggested that smaller communities often lose out to larger municipalities with muscle when it comes to funding infrastructure projects. The General believed that delineating floodplains was another good topic and that there was an appropriate Federal role in all of these challenges.

Finally, the General asked rhetorically why the Army is involved in these issues. He offered the simple answer that the Army's mission evolved this way. The country's first engineers were in the Army and the first engineering school was at West Point, New York. The dilemma is that the nation's primary advocate for water resources is inside the Department of Defense, at the level of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works. This position is not on par with other advocate positions, such as those in the fields of environmental protection or transportation. General Madsen again thanked the audience for attending and for sharing their time and ideas as they apply to the region and to the nation. The workshop was then adjourned. The public statements collected in conjunction with this listening session are included as Appendix B.

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPTION OF COMMENTS REGARDING IDENTIFIED CHALLENGES

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT PHOENIX LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

Challenge A	
The USACE should become a national resource for national watershed programs, by acting as a broad-based resource for proactive, national watershed management. The USACE should treat watersheds as a whole, looking at all of the needs within the watershed itself, because each watershed functions as a distinct unit.	
1	A holistic approach is needed. Instead of a piecemeal, narrow focus approach. Expeditious <u>funding</u> mechanism is needed. Need education, training, tech. Support review and revise MED policies.
2	Not only from local community support, but to make it successful administration must support initiatives.
3	Some federal agency needs to assume this role.
4	Large spaces and recent development have left us with lots of planning to do.
Challenge B	
The 404 Permit process takes too long; funding opportunities are lost, or projects can't be maintained. The USACE is perceived as a regulator, rather than a facilitator.	
5	We need a program to fast track simple projects.
6	COE is reg agencies vs. facilitators.
7	Info could be used before public comment and should be considered by agency as part of a comprehensive review of 404.
8	The Corps process is better suited to large projects. Small projects can be a regulatory problem.
Challenge C	
Implement regional planning for water issues, including better regional cooperation and planning among various agencies, cities and municipalities. This approach can expedite projects and avoid litigation.	
9	Communities need to work together as a region to resolve potable water issues. Communities are doing by focusing on their area in isolation. Need to work together to get a system of water delivery to entire region.
10	The challenge is important for the following: expedite resolution of water resource issues.
Challenge D	
Take a holistic approach to natural resource management; there is too much emphasis on “Band-Aids,” not enough attention to entire watershed system.	
11	H2O is finite – if we can improve capture and safe release from watershed, we've solved <u>many</u> problems before they arise.
Challenge E	
The USACE must be more proactive instead of reactive; it must adequately maintain flood control projects, and must take emergency maintenance actions quickly after damage has been done.	
12	Increased potential for additional damage instead of repairing/replacing the existing structure(s).

Challenge F	
Clearly define the missions, roles and regulations of all Federal agencies, including the USACE; it is very confusing to the public.	
13	Eliminate conflicting missions, regulations, and competing between agencies.
14	Agencies should work together to solve problems together – technical and funding and staffing to benefit all users and citizens.
15	When researching who could help rural communities experiencing water shortage, I found <u>many</u> agencies – fed – state – local – had a piece of the pie. One federal agency can help with delivery system and pumping when water is found. Another can provide technical assistance to find water and design pump. A state agency can help with loan to drill well. One federal agency can help with water for people only – another can help with water for <u>animals</u> only. It is a real “goat rope” tracking down helpful resources.
16	<p>Acc impacted fed agencies need to meet jointly to determine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - current state of affairs of national water resources - define mission/roles and responsibilities of agencies - overlaps - prepare report for administration/Congress - including action steps necessary <p>Administration adopts report – supports findings.</p> <p>Comments solicited from Ac fed agencies and those stakeholders the agencies represent.</p> <p>Finalize report.</p>
Challenge G	
Lack of Federal money means that problems get dumped on local agencies, which may not be equipped to handle the problem. Rural jurisdictions have the least resources to handle problems.	
Challenge H	
More consistency in USACE regulatory functions/policies; this will avoid delays.	
19	????? delays and circumventing regulations.
20	Regulations are better suited to Eastern watersheds.
21	Cookie cutter – one size fits all not appropriate in the West.
22	COE seems to be the bad guy, don’t help the process.
23	Too often, Federal regulators, or EPA, vetoes permits (or stops the application for permits) based on political factors – substituting their own “desires” for those of states; local governments, on vital transportation (roads) or water, or many other projects for public good.
Challenge I	
Rural and urban water/sewer infrastructure needs to be improved; emphasize water re-use and maintenance of old structures.	
24	West has been unregulated and undeveloped for so long we have an enormous backlog of work to do.

Challenge J	
Need to recognize value of both structural and non-structural flood control projects; there is a need for both types of solutions	
Challenge K	
Availability, reliability and accessibility of water resources; it is imperative to identify new sources of water and protect water quality.	
25	Need to address aging infrastructure, sources of water, quality of water, sustain/support growth.
Challenge L	
Resolve changing and conflicting priorities among stakeholders (e.g., among users of a river system)	
26	Endangered species; special interest groups; local (historic uses); recreation
28	Priorities of one may impact the need of another. Priority is a desire, need is critical.
Challenge M	
Open up communications to non-sponsor stakeholders; e.g. One city's waste water is the next city's water supply, so the USACE needs to talk to the second (i.e., non-sponsor) city as well.	
29	Causing more problems down stream.
Challenge N	
Focus on non-structural solutions and approaches to flood control; people don't want concrete ditches, Congress should pay FEMA to implement non-structural solutions.	
30	Understand how a floodway works and then work with the established criteria/process. Working with nature will be more successful than trying to back grade.
Challenge O	
Identify and delineate floodplains, including the ordinary high-water mark; it will prevent development from occurring in floodplains. Floodplain maps badly need to be updated.	
32	Prevents development from occurring. Proactive vs. reactive Best bang for the buck.
33	66% of flood damages occur outside of the mapped floodplains. Tributaries of large watersheds are usually unmapped in rural areas.
41	The definition of the average annual flow is undefined in the channels they may only flow every few years, and said channels do not even come close to confining the flows that do happen.
Challenge P	
Federal money seems to go to those who need it the least; i.e., cities that know how to get funds from Congress receive more money, rather than the disadvantaged or rural communities. Need more equitable disbursement of funds.	
38	Legal advice, process assistance, more funding, more accessibility to local (rural) agencies.
Challenge Q	
Need to clarify water rights in the Western United States.	
39	Insure people upstream and downstream understand rights.

Challenge R	
USACE projects must place emphasis on public beneficiary rather than private beneficiaries; funding comes from public sector and must have public benefit, rather than going to projects for special interest groups.	
Challenge S	
Regional regulations/solutions for regional problems. USACE should develop more succinct definitions in its permitting process; definitions created to solve problems in the East don't necessarily apply in the West.	
40	Rules and regulations developed for navigable rivers and bays are applied to dry rivers and washes where applicability is nonexistent.
41	The definition of the average annual flow is undefined in the channels the may only flow every few years, and said channels do not even come close to confining the flows that do happen.
Challenge T	
Environmental regulations are unfair and are based on poor science; Federal government needs to have consistency within the regulatory process.	
42	Not an equal application of regs from one agency to another.
Challenge U	
Develop creative solutions to water supply, such as water marketing, desalinization, use of icebergs. Use the water supply that is closest to an area (e.g., Los Angeles should desalinate water from the ocean rather than taking water from sources far away).	
Challenge V	
USACE must re-examine cost-sharing percentages of local sponsors; percentages of funding required from local sponsors has been raised, and this can hurt rural areas that aren't able to fund the projects that they need.	
Challenge W	
USACE must address lack of project implementation; many emergency programs on the books have not yet been built by the USACE, and it is now necessary to revisit these programs and determine whether to fund/build them.	
USACE must address lack of project implementation; many emergency programs on the books have not yet been built by the USACE, and it is now necessary to revisit these programs and determine whether to fund/build them. Additional Challenges	
43	Wasting monies to buy land technically owned by the feds. The treaty of Guadeloupe Hidalgo states all waterways/washes/rivers in the area acquired by the USA are to be public, yet in AZ they have been treated as private lands.
44	Fed structures are "permanent" but society's values change – what do we do about that? (i.e., when do we stop maintaining old projects – and change them instead?) (lack of flexibility)
45	Who pays vs. who benefits (i.e., by being relocated, etc.).
46	Make restoration projects an amenity and create opportunities for public education. Environmental education should be included in Corps mission. Wonderful restoration projects are being constructed that can be managed as public use facilities. Corps should help local sponsors facilitate environmental education opportunities created by restoration projects.

47	<p>404 – O&M of rehabilitation/restoration projects. Local sponsors should be able to obtain long term O&M 404 permits for projects sponsored by Corps.</p> <p>Local sponsor must be able to operate project as intended long term. Need assistance from Corps in obtaining long term O&M permits.</p>
48	Water resource issues must be dealt with at Cabinet level.

APPENDIX B

SUBMITTED PUBLIC STATEMENTS AND MATERIALS